



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/531,942	04/19/2005	Yi Li	2085-04000	4511
23505	7590	02/14/2011		
CONLEY ROSE, P.C. David A. Rose P. O. BOX 3267 HOUSTON, TX 77253-3267			EXAMINER PARK, JEONG S	
			ART UNIT 2454	PAPER NUMBER
			NOTIFICATION DATE 02/14/2011	DELIVERY MODE ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

pathou@conleyrose.com

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/531,942

Applicant(s)

LI, YI

Examiner

Jeong S. Park

Art Unit

2454

Period for Reply
-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 November 2010.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-28 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-28 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-942)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This communication is in response to Application No. 10/531,942 filed on 8/31/2004. The amendment presented on 11/23/2010, which amends claims 1 and 10, and adds new claims 25-28, is hereby acknowledged. Claims 1-28 have been examined.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments filed 11/23/2010, with respect to claims 1-28 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1, 2, 5-8, 10, 11, 14-17 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mao et al. (hereinafter Mao)(US Pub. No. 2003/0088876) in view of Terefenko (US Pub. No. 2002/0083193).

Regarding claims 1 and 10, Mao teaches as follows:

A data acquisition source management (a video on demand (hereinafter VOD) gateway manages multiple incompatible and non-interoperable VOD systems, see, e.g.,

abstract) method comprising:

generating a source list identifying a set of acquisition sources (interpreted as multiple VOD systems, 30, 50 and 60 in figure 2A) coupled to a Real- time Multimedia Data On Demand (RTMDOD) server (RTMDOD server is interpreted as VOD gateway which includes VOD asset gateway 72, VOD session gateway 74 and VOD transaction gateway 76 in figure 2A)(VOD asset gateway aggregates video inventory from multiple VOD vendor's equipment and presents a listing of VOD titles to the viewer, see, e.g., page 1, paragraph [0012]) each acquisition source within the set of acquisition sources for provision of data therefrom (VOD systems deliver video (equivalent to applicant's data) to the set-top box over the CATV system, see, e.g., page 2, paragraph [0029]);

receiving a list request from a data requestor system (set-top box 40 in figure 2A) in data communication with the RTMDOD server (the VOD client software communicates with the VOD asset management system to display lists of available video programming to the CATV subscriber, see, e.g., page 2, paragraph [0025]), the data requester system (set-top box 40 in figure 2A) distinct from the set of acquisition sources (multiple VOD systems, 30, 50 and 60 in figure 2A) and the RTMDOD server (VOD gateway which includes VOD asset gateway 72, VOD session gateway 74 and VOD transaction gateway 76 in figure 2A)(see, e.g., paragraph [0029] and figure 2A);

providing the source list to the data requestor system in response to the list request (the unified lists of VOD assets is presented at the set-top box, see, e.g., page 2, paragraph [0028]);

receiving a data request from the data requestor system at the RTMDOD server,

the data request identifying a first acquisition source within the set of acquisition sources from which data is to be provided (the VOD session gateway receives the request for the given video from the subscriber via the set-top box, see, e.g., page 2, paragraph [0029]);

transmitting a data acquisition request from the RTMDOD server to the first acquisition source in response to the data request (the VOD session gateway receives the request for the given video and communicates with the appropriate VOD system that serves the particular given video selected by the subscriber, see, e.g., page 2, paragraph [0029]); and

initiating the transmission of data at the first acquisition source in response to the data acquisition request (the selected VOD system delivers the purchased video to the set-top box over the CATV system, see, e.g., page 2, paragraph [0029]).

Mao does not explicitly teach of generating a source list comprising a device but generating data list available from acquisition sources.

Terefenko teaches as follows:

An application program running on the client device can request a file or other data stream, such as video streams, audio streams, and combinations of video and audio streams, that resides on one or more of the servers (equivalent to applicant's sources). The request is intercepted by the module which forwards the request to the content director server (equivalent to applicant's RTMDOD server). The content director server **returns a list indicating which of the servers** currently is storing a complete, or substantially complete, copy of the requested data stream in its memory. Each server

is instructed to transfer data blocks that differ from the blocks being transferred by the other servers. In other words, preferably, every data block in **the data stream is sent by one of the servers** (see, e.g., paragraph [0029]).

Therefore, Terefenko teaches of returning a list of servers storing requested data stream and the requested data stream is provided from the selected server to the client device (equivalent to applicant's data requester system).

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Mao with Terefenko to include a content director server as taught by Terefenko in order to efficiently provide a server list (equivalent to applicant's source list) storing the requested data stream.

Regarding claims 2 and 11, Mao teaches as follows:

Providing a data response from the RTMDOD server to the data requestor system in response to the data request being received by the RTMDOD server from the data requestor system (client sends "clientsessionsetup" message to the session gateway (502 in figure 5A) via session resource manager (504 in figure 5A hereinafter SRM) in step 2 and the SRM sends "clientsessionsetupconfirm" message to the client in step 12, see, e.g., page 6, paragraph [0110]-[0121] and figure 5A).

Regarding claims 5 and 14, Mao teaches as follows:

Providing the data response from the RTMDOD server to the data requestor system comprises transmitting data from the RTMDOD server to the data requestor system, the data being provided by at least one acquisition source within the set of acquisition sources indicated by and in response to the data request (the selected VOD

system delivers the purchased video to the set-top box over the CATV system, see, e.g., page 2, paragraph [0029]).

Regarding claims 6 and 15, Mao teaches as follows:

The data transmitted from the at least one acquisition source to the RTMDOD server is subsequently received by the data requestor system in real-time therefrom (real time streaming protocol (hereinafter RTSP) supported for communication between VOD client 544 and VOD server 540 via session gateway 542, see, e.g., page 7, paragraph [0137]-[0142] and figure 6).

Regarding claims 7 and 16, Mao teaches as follows:

The data received by the RTMDOD server from the at least one acquisition source comprises multimedia data (video on demand system used for delivering video on client demand, see, e.g., abstract).

Regarding claims 8 and 17, Mao teaches as follows:

Providing an error message to the data requestor system by the RTMDOD server in response to the data request in the event that a data transmission error occurs following transmitting the data acquisition request from the RTMDOD server to the first acquisition source (the session gateway communicates with the set-top box and VOD servers, therefore the session gateway inherently provides or has capability of providing a message in response to a communication failure between the set-top box and the VOD servers, see, e.g., page 3, paragraph [0039]).

Regarding claim 19, Mao teaches as follows:

Each acquisition source (VOD system) within the set of acquisition sources is in data communication with the RTMDOD server (VOD gateway)(VOD asset gateway aggregates video inventory from multiple VOD systems, see, e.g., page 1, paragraph [0012]) .

5. Claims 3, 4, 9, 12, 13 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mao et al. (hereinafter Mao)(US Pub. No. 2003/0088876) in view of Terefenko (US Pub. No. 2002/0083193), and further in view of Kumar et al. (hereinafter Kumar)(US Patent No. 7,188,151).

Regarding claims 3 and 12, Mao in view of Terefenko does not teach of registration process for the acquisition sources.

Kumar teaches as follows:

Transmitting registration data (logon ID and password) from the set of acquisition sources to the RTMDOD server (creating a session with the system by transmitting a logon ID and password, see, e.g., col. 8, lines 20-43);

verifying the registration data from the set of acquisition sources by the RTMDOD server (registration 1002 in figure 10 and individual client 1102 in figure 11, verification is inherently included for session login procedure); and

registering the set of acquisition sources onto the source list and storing the registration data corresponding to the registered set of acquisition sources onto a source database (profile database 1204 in figure 12) in response to the registration data

being verified (entered user profile is written in the profile database, see, e.g., col. 9, lines 34-37 and figure 12).

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Mao in view of Terefenko with Kumar in order to securely register available resources before using as a resource provider.

Regarding claims 4 and 13, Mao in view of Terefenko does not teach of registration process for the data requestor.

Kumar teaches as follows:

Transmitting log-in data from the data requestor system (provider) to the RTMDOD server (provider can immediately view their patient's real time data by joining the session, see, e.g., col. 8, lines 57-59 and figure 11 for service provider registration); registering the data requestor system onto a requestor list in response to receiving the log-in data therefrom, the requestor list identifying a plurality of data requestor systems (see, e.g., col. 9, lines 51-59 and figure 15); and

transmitting the source list to each data requestor system within the plurality of data requestor systems registered on the requestor list (the provider can view streaming and/or saved data relating to the patient by selecting button 504 in figure 5, see, e.g., col. 8, lines 47-56).

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Mao in view of Terefenko with Kumar in order to authenticate the VOD subscriber before presenting a listing of VOD titles to the subscriber.

Regarding claims 9 and 18, Mao in view of Terefenko does not teach of updating the acquisition source status.

Kumar teaches as follows:

Verifying status of each acquisition source registered on the source list, the status of each acquisition source being one of active and inactive (Admin module 1010 in figure 19 shows the clients submodule 1902 includes servlets that display disabled and enabled clients and modify the profile of client, see, e.g., col. 11, lines 1-26 and figure 19);

updating the source list by removing each acquisition source having a status of inactive therefrom (the provider is notified that a session is in progress via a flashing "live" button, see, e.g., col. 8, lines 47-56); and

transmitting the updated source list to each of the plurality of data requestor system registered on the requestor list (the provider is notified that a session is in progress via a flashing "live" button, see, e.g., col. 8, lines 47-56).

Therefore they are rejected for similar reason as presented above in claim 4.

6. Claims 20-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mao et al. (hereinafter Mao)(US Pub. No. 2003/0088876) in view of Terefenko (US Pub. No. 2002/0083193), and further in view of Bakshi et al. (hereinafter Bakshi)(US Patent No. 6,574,663).

Regarding claims 20-24, Mao in view of Terefenko does not explicitly teach of updating status of each acquisition source periodically.

Regarding claim 20, Bakshi teaches as follows:

The status of each acquisition source within the set of acquisition sources is verifiable periodically (active device reports status periodically to the topology server, see, e.g., col. 5, lines 15-27).

Regarding claim 21, Bakshi teaches as follows:

The status of each acquisition source within the set of acquisition sources is verifiable by transmitting a status signal from each acquisition source within the set of acquisition sources to the RTMDOD server (active device reports status periodically to the topology server, see, e.g., col. 5, lines 15-27).

Regarding claims 22 and 23, Bakshi teaches as follows:

The status of each acquisition source within the set of acquisition sources which is in data communication with the RTMDOD server is an active status (active device reports status periodically to the topology server, see, e.g., col. 5, lines 15-27).

Regarding claim 24, it is rejected for similar reason as presented above in claims 20 and 21.

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Mao in view of Terefenko with Bakshi in order to efficiently update status information periodically to the managing server.

7. Claims 25-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mao et al. (hereinafter Mao)(US Pub. No. 2003/0088876) in view of Terefenko (US Pub.

No. 2002/0083193), and further in view of Hatakama et al. (hereinafter Hatakama)(US Pub. No. 2002/0147661).

Regarding claim 25, Mao in view of Terefenko does not teach of the source device configured for data capture.

Hatakama teaches as follows:

Wherein each acquisition source comprises a device configured for data capture (a content server (equivalent to applicant's acquisition source) is a server computer that provides the mobile phones and terminal stations with various data delivery services including sales of picture data. The content server is also coupled to the fixed cameras (equivalent to applicant's device configured for data capture), which are located at various places such as street corners, so that the views of streets will be captured in real time, see, e.g., paragraph [0050]).

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Mao in view of Terefenko with Hatakama to include a content server coupled with cameras as taught by Hatakama in order to efficiently provide captured data in real time.

Regarding claim 26, Mao in view of Terefenko does not teach of the source device configured for real-time data capture.

Hatakama teaches as follows:

The content server is also coupled to the fixed cameras (equivalent to applicant's device configured for data capture), which are located at various places such as street

corners, so that the views of streets will be **captured in real time** (see, e.g., paragraph [0050]).

Therefore, it is rejected for similar reason as presented above in claim 25.

Regarding claim 27, Mao in view of Terefenko does not teach of the source device configured for real-time data capture.

Hatakama teaches as follows:

Initiating the real-time capture of data by the first acquisition source (the content server is also coupled to the fixed cameras (equivalent to applicant's device configured for data capture), which are located at various places such as street corners, so that the views of streets will be captured in real time, see, e.g., paragraph [0050]); and

transmitting captured data from the first acquisition source to the data requestor system (the content server makes the captured picture data accessible to Internet users, see, e.g., paragraph [0050]).

Therefore, it is rejected for similar reason as presented above in claim 25.

Regarding claim 28, Mao in view of Terefenko does not explicitly teach of transmitting captured data over one of the Internet, an intranet, and a cellular Multimedia Messaging Service (MMS) network.

Hatakama teaches of transmitting captured data over the Internet (the content server makes the captured picture data accessible to Internet users, see, e.g., paragraph [0050]).

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Mao in view of Terefenko with Hatakama to include transmitting

captured data over the Internet as taught by Hatakama in order to utilize existing network connection.

Conclusion

8. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jeong S. Park whose telephone number is (571)270-1597. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday 9:00 - 5:30 EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph E. Avellino can be reached on 571-272-3905. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/J. S. P./
Examiner, Art Unit 2454

February 7, 2011

/Joseph E. Avellino/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2454